

Reply Comment on NPRM WT Docket No. 04-140:

I would like to respond to comment made by ARRL regarding this NPRM.

- Multiple Vanity Applications: I do not agree with the ARRL proposal to dismiss *all* vanity applications filed in multiple. There is no need for punitive action in this matter. FCC can modify the Online Filing System to allow just one vanity application per day by any individual or club trustee. I have made just such a proposal in my filings of June 2nd and June 10th on this issue. Prevention is the best cure for this malady.
- In Memoriam Designations of Call Signs: I strongly support the ARRL position that this rules change should not be made. I strongly *disagree* with the arguments asserted by John B. Johnson supporting this rules change. My concern is that amateur radio clubs could become vast repositories of call signs locked perpetually in “in memoriam” grants. If any change is made to the vanity call sign rules I would suggest that clubs be severely limited in the number of call signs so held. I would also suggest that clubs be limited to holding only one “1x2” call sign (such as W1AW). Such call signs are very limited in number and are highly valued by eligible vanity applicants. Call signs are assets of the amateur community that should remain in *active* use. They should not be sequestered in this way.

My interest in vanity call signs can be simply stated. I am an “Elmer”, as radio amateurs refer to a mentor. Over the last several years I have helped more than sixty vanity applicants find and apply for scarce 1x2 call signs such as my own. My service is rendered freely as an appreciation for the many years of enjoyment that amateur radio has given me. I believe in and strongly support FCC’s quest for “*equity and fairness*” in administering the vanity call sign program. My comments in this NPRM are based in this belief.

Respectfully submitted,

Alvin Berglund, W6WJ
Glendale, California
June 30, 2004